

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Lines 5-7 of the second paragraph on page 6 of the Amendment, filed in the above-captioned application and dated January 7, 2009, states that, "[i]nvestigation is under way to determine whether or not a traversal was made, and if made, the ground(s) thereof, and if further information become available, it will be submitted in writing." Pursuant to the above-quoted statement, and based upon information received from Robert C. Faber, no traversal was made by Robert C. Faber as part of the provisional election by telephone referred to on page 2 of the Office Action mailed in the above-captioned application on October 7, 2008, (hereinafter "the Office Action"). However, Applicants hereby traverse the Election Requirement on page 2 of the Office Action for the reasons set forth below.

The Examiner alleges, in the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the Office Action, that, "[t]he inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Group I does not share the special technical features of a mixer, palletizing [sic] device, or granulating drum, among others, of Group II." PCT Rule 13.2 provides, in pertinent part, that, "the requirement of unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features," (emphasis supplied).


However, independent claim 1, as amended, now includes a granulation drum and a mixing tool and, therefore, dependent claims 2, 4, and 5 also include those features. Since claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 now include one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features, as identified by the Examiner, with claims 7-16, it is respectfully submitted that the Election Requirement with regard to claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 and 7-16 should now be withdrawn, and claims 7-16, previously non-elected, should be rejoined for examination with claims 1, 2, 4, and 5.

In view of the foregoing remarks, allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-5, and 7-16 is respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON January 16, 2009.

RCF/MIM:lac

Respectfully submitted,



Michael I. Markowitz

Registration No.: 30,659

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700